Applied Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 6, 2012, no. 50, 2445 - 2452

Neighborhood Connected Equitable Domination in Graphs

S. Sivakumar

Department of Studies in Mathematics
University of Mysore, Mysore 570 006, India

N. D. Soner

Department of Studies in Mathematics
University of Mysore, Mysore 570 006, India

Anwar Alwardi

Department of Studies in Mathematics
University of Mysore, Mysore 570 006, India
a_wardi@hotmail.com

Abstract

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph, An equitable dominating S of a graph G is called the neighborhood connected equitable dominating set (nced-set) if the induced subgraph $\langle N_e(S)\rangle$ is connected The minimum cardinality of a nced-set of G is called the neighborhood connected equitable domination number of G and is denoted by $\gamma_{nce}(G)$. In this paper we initiate a study of this parameter. For any graph G.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C69

Keywords: Equitable domination number, Neighborhood connected equitable domination number, Chromatic number

1 Introduction

By a graph $G = (V, E)$ we mean a finite, undirected with neither loops nor multiple edges the order and size of G are denoted by p and q respectively for graph theoretic terminology we refer to Chartrand and Lesnaik [2] A subset S of V is called a dominating set if $N[S] = V$ the minimum (maximum) cardinality of a minimal dominating set of G is called the domination number (upper domination number) of G and is denoted by $\gamma(G)$, $(\Gamma(G))$. An excellent treatment of the fundamentals of domination is given in the book by Haynes etal [4] A survey of several advanced topics in domination is given in the book edited by Haynes et al. [3]. Various types of domination have been defined and studied by several authors and more than 75 models of domination are listed in the appendix of Haynes et al. [3]. Sampathkumar and Walikar [5] introduced the concept of connected domination in graphs. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $v \in V$ the open neighborhood and the closed neighborhood of v are denoted by $N(v)$ and $N[V] = N(v) \cup v$ respectively. If $S \subseteq V$ then $N(S) = \cup_{v \in S} N(v)$ and $N[S] = N(S) \cup S$. If $S \subseteq V$ and $u \in S$ then the private neighbor set of u with respect to S is defined by $Pn[u, S] = \{v : N[v] \cap S = \{u\}\}$.

A dominating set S of G is called a connected dominating set if the induced subgraph $< \langle S \rangle$ is connected the minimum cardinality of a connected dominating set of G is called the connected domination number of G and is denoted by $\gamma_c(G)$. A dominating set S of a connected graph G is called a neighborhood connected dominating set (ncd-set) if the induced subgraph $\langle N(S) \rangle$ is connected. The minimum cardinality of a ncd-set of G is called the neighborhood connected domination number of G and is denoted by $\gamma_{nc}(G)$. A ncd-set S is said to be minimal if no proper subset of S is a ncd-set. A coloring of a graph G is an assignment of colors to the vertices of G such that no two adjacent vertices receive the same color. The minimum integer K for which a graph G is $k-$colorable is called the chromatic number of G and is denoted by $\chi(G)$.

A subset S of V is called an equitable dominating set if for every $v \in V - S$ there exist a vertex $u \in S$ such that $uv \in E(G)$ and $|d(u) - d(v)| \leq 1$. The minimum cardinality of such a equitable dominating set is denoted by γ_e and is called the equitable domination number of G. A vertex u V is said to be degree equitable with a vertex $v \in V$ if $|d(u) - d(v)| \leq 1$. If S is an equitable dominating set then any super set of S is an equitable dominating set. An equitable set S is said to be a minimal equitable dominating set if no proper subset of S is an equitable dominating set. The minimal upper equitable dominating number is Γ_e the upper equitable dominating set of G. If $u \in V$ such that $|d(u) - d(v)| \geq 2$ for every $v \in N(u)$ then u is in every equitable dominating set such points are called equitable isolates. I_e denotes the set of all equitable isolates. An equitable dominating S of connected graph G is called an equitable connected dominating set (ecd-set) if the induced subgraph $\langle S \rangle$ is connected. The minimum cardinality of a ecd-set of G is called the equitable connected domination number of G and is denoted by $\gamma_{ec}(G)$. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $u \in V$ the equitable neighborhood of u denoted by $N_e(u)$ is defined as $N_e(u) = \{v \in V : |v \in N(u), |d(u) - d(v)| \leq 1\}$. The maximum and minimum equitable degree of a point in G are denoted by $\Delta_e(G)$ and $\delta_e(G)$ that is $\Delta_e(G) = max_{u \in V(G)} |N_e(u)|$ and $\delta_e(G) = min_{u \in V(G)} |N_e(u)|$.

The open equitable neighbourhood and closed equitable neighbourhood of v are denoted by $N_e(v)$ and $N_e[v] = N_e(v) \cup \{v\}$ respectively. If $S \subseteq V$ then $N_e(S) = \cup_{v \in S} N_e(v)$ and $N[S] = N_e(S) \cup S$. If $S \subseteq V$ and $u \in S$ then the private equitable neighbor set of u with respect to S is defined by $pne[u, S] = N_e[u] - N_e[S - \{u\}]$.

2 Main Results

Definition. An equitable dominating set S of a graph G is called the neighborhood connected equitable dominating set (nced-set) if the induced subgraph $\langle N_e(S) \rangle$ is connected the minimum cardinality of a nced-set of G is called the neighborhood connected equitable domination number of G and is denoted by $\gamma_{nce}(G)$.
Examples: γ_{nce} value for well known graphs

1)$\gamma_{nce}(K_p) = 1$

2)$\gamma_{nce}(P_p) = \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil$

3)$\gamma_{nce}(C_p)=\begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor, & \text{if } p \equiv 3(mod4); \\ \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

4)$\gamma_{nce}(W_p)=\begin{cases} \lceil \frac{p-1}{2} + 1 \rceil, & \text{if } p \equiv 3(mod4); \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

5)$\gamma_{nce}(K_{r,t})=\begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } |r-t| \leq 1; \\ r+t, & \text{if } |r-t| \geq 2 \text{ and } r,t \geq 2. \end{cases}$

In the following proposition we determine the relation between the $\gamma_{nce}(G)$ and the others invariant domination parameters.

Theorem 2.1 *For any graph G 1. $\gamma(G) \leq \gamma_{nc}(G) \leq \gamma_{nce}(G)$.*

2. $\gamma(G) \leq \gamma_{nce}(G) \leq 2\gamma(G)$.

3. $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq \gamma_{ec}(G)$.

4. $\gamma(G) \leq \gamma_e(G)$.

.

Theorem 2.2 *For any path P_p, $\gamma_{nce}(P_p) = \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil$.*

Proof. Let $P_p = \{v_1, v_{2,\ldots,v_p}\}$. If p $not \equiv 1(mod4)$. Then $S = \{v_{j:j=2k,2k+1 \text{ } and \text{ } k \text{ } is \quad odd}\}$ is a nced-set of P_p and if $p \equiv 1(mod4)$, then $S_i = S \cup \{v_{p-1}\}$ is a nced-set of

P_p. Hence, $\gamma_{nce}(P_p) \leq \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil$. Since $\gamma_{nc}(P_p) = \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil$ and $\gamma_{nc}(G) \leq \gamma_{nce}(G)$. We have $\lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil \leq \gamma_{nce}(G)$. Thus $\gamma_{nce}(P_p) = \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil$.

Corollary 2.2.1. For any non-trivial path P_p

a)$\gamma_{nce}(P_p) = \gamma(P_p)$ if and only if p=2 or 4

b)$\gamma_{nce}(P_p) = \gamma_e(P_p)$ if and only if p=2 or 4

Proof. Since $\gamma(P_p) = \gamma_e(P_p) = \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil$ the corollary follows.

Theorem 2.3 $\gamma_{nce}(C_p)=\begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor, & \textit{if } p \equiv 3(mod4); \\ \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Proof. Let $V(C_p) = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_p\}$ and $p = 4k + r$ where, $0 \leq r \leq 3$.

Let $S_1=\begin{cases} S, & \text{if } p \equiv 0(mod4); \\ S \cup \{v_p\}, & p \equiv 1 \textit{ or } 2(mod4); \\ S \cup \{v_{p-1}\}, & p \equiv 3(mod4). \end{cases}$

Clearly S_1 is nced-set of C_p and hence

$$\gamma_{nce}(C_p) \leq \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor, & \text{if } p \equiv 3(mod4); \\ \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now Let S be any γ_{nce} - set of C_p then $< S >$ contains at most one isolated vertex.

And $\langle N_e(S) \rangle=\begin{cases} C_p, & p \equiv 0(mod4); \\ P_{p-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Hence

$$|S| \geq \gamma_{nce}(C_p)=\begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor, & \text{if } p \equiv 3(mod4); \\ \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

And the result follows.

Corollary 2.3.1.

1) $\gamma_{nce}(C_p) = \gamma(C_p)$ if and only if $p = 3, 4$ or 7

2) $\gamma_{nce}(C_p) = \gamma_e(C_p)$ if and only if $p = 3, 4$ or 5, 7, 8

3) $\gamma_{nce}(C_p) = \gamma_{nc}(C_p)$ if and only if $p \equiv 0, 1, 3, (mod4)$.

Proof. Since $\gamma(C_p) = \lceil \frac{p}{3} \rceil$,$\gamma_{nc}(C_p) = p - 2$

$$\gamma_e(C_p)=\begin{cases} \lceil \frac{p}{3} + 1 \rceil, & \text{if } p \equiv 2(mod3); \\ \lfloor \frac{p}{3} \rfloor, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\gamma_{nc}(C_p)=\begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor, & \text{if } p \equiv 3(mod4); \\ \lceil \frac{p}{3} \rceil, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The result follows

Lemma A. A super set of a nced-set is a nced-set.

Proof. Let S be a nced-set of a graph G and let $S_1 = S \cup \{v\}$ where, $v \in V - S$. Clearly $v \in N_e(S)$ and S_1 is a dominating set of G. Now let $x, y \in N_e(S_1)$. If $x, y \in N_e(S)$, then any $x - y$ path in $N_e(S)$ is a $x - y$ path in $N_e(S_1)$. If $x \in N_e(S)$ and $y \notin Ne(S)$, then $y \in N_e(v)$ and any $x - v$ path in $N_e(S)$ followed by the edge vy is $x - y$ path in $N_e(S_1)$. Also if $x, y \notin N_e(S)$ then (x, v, y) is a $x - y$ path in $N_e(S_1)$. Thus $\langle N_e(S_1)\rangle$ is connected so that S_1 is a nced-set of G.

Theorem 2.4 *A nced-set S of a graph G is minimal nced-set if and only if for every $u \in S$ one of the following holds*

1)$pne[u, S] \neq \phi$

2)There exist two vertices $x, y \in N_e(S)$ such that every $x-y$ path in $\langle N_e(S)\rangle$ contains at least one vertex of $N_e(S) - N_e(S - \{u\})$.

Proof. Let S be a minimal nced-set of G, Let $u \in S$ and let $S_1 = S \cup \{u\}$ is disconnected. If S_1 is not a dominating set of G or $\langle N_e(S_1)\rangle$ is disconnected. If S_1 is not a dominating set of G, then $pne[u, S] \neq \phi$. If $\langle N_e(S_1)\rangle$ is disconnected. Then there exist two vertices $x, y \in N_e(S_1)$ such that there is no $x - y$ path in $\langle N_e(S_1)\rangle$ since $\langle N_e(S)\rangle$ connected, it follows that every $x - y$ path in $\langle N_e(S)\rangle$ contains at least one vertex of $N_e(S) - N_e(S - \{u\})$ conversely, if S is a nced-set of G satisfying the conditions of the theorem.

Theorem 2.5 *Let G be a graph with $\Delta_e = p - 1$ then $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 1$ or 2 further $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 2$ if and only if G has exactly one vertex v with $deg_e(v) = p - 1$ and v is a cut vertex of G.*

Proof. Let $v \in V(G)$ and $deg_e(v) = p - 1$. Then $\{u, v\}$ where $u \in V - \{v\}$ is a nced-set of G so that $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq 2$ now suppose $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 2$, then $\langle N_e(v)\rangle = G - v$ is disconnected and hence v is a cutvertex of G. Hence it follows that v is only vertex of G with $deg_e(v) = p - 1$. The converse is obvious.

Theorem 2.6 *Let G be a graph without any equitable isolated point with $\Delta_e \leq p - 1$. Then $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq p - \Delta_e$.*

Proof. Let $v \in V(G)$ and $deg_e(v) = \Delta_e$. Since G is connected and $\Delta_e \leq p - 1$ there exist two adjacent vertices u and w such that$u \in N_e(v)$ and $w \notin N_e(v)$. Now let$S = (N_e(v) - \{u\}) \cup \{w\}$. Clearly $V - S$ is a nced-set of G and hence $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq p - \Delta_e$.

Theorem 2.7 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph such that $V = \{v_1, ..., v_p\}$ and $deg_e(v_i) \geq 1$ and G have k pendant vertices. Then $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq p - k$.*

Proof. Let X be the set of all pendant vertices of a graph G. Let $|X| = k$. Then $(V - X)$ is nced-set of G.
Hence $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq p - k$

A graph with $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq p - k$

Theorem 2.8 *Let G be a graph with $\Delta_e = p - 1$ and let $v \in V(G)$ with $deg_e(v) = \Delta_e$ then $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq 1 + |V(H)|$, where H is a component of $G - v$ with $|V(H)|$ is minimum.*

Proof. Let $v \in V(G)$ with $deg_e(v) = p - 1$. If $G - v$ is connected then $\{v\}$ is a nced-set of G and hence $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 1$ suppose $G - v$ is disconnected then $S = \{v\}$ is not a nced-set of G. Let H be a component of $G - v$ with minimum vertices. Hence $S \cup (V(H)$ is a nced-set of G. Thus $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq 1 + |V(H)|$.
Remark: The bound given in above is sharp the graph $G = K_{1,2}$, $\gamma_{nce} = 2 = 1 + |V(H)|$.
Corollary 2.8.1. Let G be a graph with $\Lambda_e = p - 1$. Then $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 2$ if and only if there exists a support vertex v such that $deg_e(v) = p - 1$.

Theorem 2.9 *If T is non-trivial tree, then $\gamma_{nce}(T) \leq p - 1$ such that T is not a star.*

Proof. Since T is non-trivial tree this implies that $V - v$ is a nced-set of T. Thus it holds

Theorem 2.10 *For any graph$\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil$ if G has no equitable isolated vertex.*

Proof. If T is any spanning tree then $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq \gamma_{nce}(T)$. It is enough to prove the result for trees which we prove by induction on p obviously the result is true when $p = 2$ or 3 we now assume that the result is true for all trees of order less than p and let T be a tree of order $p \geq 4$. If p is odd let $T_1 = T - \{v\}$ where, v is a pendant vertex of T then $\gamma_{nce}(T_1) \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$ so that$\gamma_{nce}(T) \leq \gamma_{nce}(T_1) + 1 \leq \lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil$.

Theorem 2.11 *For any graph G with $\Delta_e \geq 1$, $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq 2q - p + 1$.*

Proof. clearly from the definition of the neighbourhood connected equitable dominating set we have $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq p - 1$, then $\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq p - 1 = 2(p - 1) - (p - 1) \leq 2q - p + 1$.

Theorem 2.12 *For any non-trivial graph G, $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \chi(G) \leq 2p - 1$ and equality holds if and only if G is isomorphic to K_2.*

Proof. If $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \chi(G) = 2p$, then $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p$ and $\chi(G) = p$ then G is a complete graph with $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p$ which gives G is trivial and hence $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \chi(G) \leq 2p - 1$.
Let G be a graph with $\gamma_{nce}(G)+\chi(G) = 2p-1$. Then either (i) $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p-1$, $\chi(G) = p$ or (ii) $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p$, $\chi(G) = p-1$. If (i) is holds then G is a complete graph with $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p - 1$ which gives $p = 2$. Hence G is isomorphic to K_2.

If (ii) holds then G is a isomorphic to $K_p - X$ where X is non empty subset of set of edges incident with a vertex v of K_p with $|X| \leq p - 2$ which implies $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 1$ or 2. Then $p = 2$ and hence G is disconnected which is a contradiction. The converse is obvious.

Theorem 2.13 *Let G be a graph. Then $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \chi(G) = 2p - 2$ if and only if G is isomorphic to K_3 or P_3 or the graph obtained from $k \cup H$ where $K = K_{n-2}$ and H is either K_2 or $\overline{K_2}$ with $V(H) = \{u, v\}$ by adding p_1 edges between u and K and adding p_2 edges between v and K, $2 \leq p_i \leq p - 5$, $i = 1$ or 2, such that $[N_e(u) \cap N_e(v)] - \{u, v\} = \phi$ and $p_1 + p_2 < p - 2$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \chi(G) = 2p - 2$. Then one of the following is true (i) $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p-2$,$\chi(G) = p$, (ii) $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p-1$, $\chi(G) = p-1$, (iii) $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p$, $\chi(G) = p - 2$.

If G is complete graph then (i) holds such that $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p-2$ this implies $p = 3$. Hence G is isomorphic to K_3.
If G is isomorphic $K_p - X$ where X is a non empty subset of set of edges incident with a vertex of K_p with $|X| \leq p - 2$ which implies $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 1$ or 2 then $p = 2$ or 3 and hence G is isomorphic to P_3.
Suppose (iii) holds. Because $\chi(G) = p - 2$ either G has a complete subgraph of order $p - 2$ or $p > 4$ and G is the join of K_{p-5} with C_5 (in case $p = 5$ by the join of K_{p-5} and C_5 we mean C_5'). If G is the join of K_{p-5} with C_5 then $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \chi(G) = 6$ if $p = 5$ or $p - 1$ if $p > 5$. In either case, $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \chi(G) \neq 2p - 2$. Thus G has a complete subgraph G_1 of order $p - 2$. Let $Y = V(G) - V(G1) = \{u, v\}$. Then $\langle Y \rangle = K_2$ or $\overline{K_2}$.
. **Case 1:** $\langle Y \rangle = \overline{K_2}$
Since G is a connected graph each u and v are equitable adjacent to at least one vertex of G_1. If either u or v is a pendant vertex then $\gamma_{nce}(G) < p$. Hence each u and v are adjacent to at least two vertices in G_1. If u and v have a common neighbor w in G_1, then $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 1$ which gives a contradiction. Hence $N_e(u) \cap N_e(v) = \phi$. If $N_e(u) \cap N_e(v) = V(G1)$ then $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 2$ which is a contradiction. Then the graph is isomorphic to the graph given in the theorem.
Case 2: $\langle Y \rangle = K_2$
Since G is connected and $\gamma_{nce}(G) = p$ we have each u and v are equitable

adjacent to at least one vertex of G_1. If u and v have a common neighbor w in G_1, then $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 1$ or 2 which gives a contradiction. Hence $N_e(u) \cap N_e(v) = \phi$ suppose $N_e(u) \cap N_e(v) = x$ then $\{u, x\}$ is a γ_{nce}-set G which is a contradiction. Hence each u and v are adjacent to more than one vertex in G_1. If $[N_e(u) \cup N_e(v)] - \{u, v\} = V(G_1)$ then $\gamma_{nce}(G) = 2$ which is a contradiction then the graph is isomorphic to the graph in the theorem. The Converse is obvious.

Nordhaus Gaddum type result:

Theorem 2.14 *For any graph G, $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \gamma_{nce}(\overline{G}) \leq (p-1)(p-2)$.*

Proof. Since from Proposition 2.11 we have

$$\gamma_{nce}(G) \leq 2q - p + 1$$
$$\gamma_{nce}(\overline{G}) \leq 2\overline{q} - p + 1$$

Now

$$\gamma_{nce}(G) + \gamma_{nce}(\overline{G}) \leq (2\overline{q} - p + 1) + (2q - p + 1)$$

Hence $\gamma_{nce}(G) + \gamma_{nce}(\overline{G}) \leq (p-1)(p-2)$.

References

[1] Arumugam, S. and Sivagnanam. C., "Neighborhood connected domination in graphs", J. Combin. Math, Combin, Comput., Vol.73, PP.55-64, 2010.

[2] G. Chartrand and L. Lesnaik, Graphs and Digraphs, Chapman and Hall. CRC, 4th edition, 2005.

[3] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and P.J. Slater, (Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs) Marcel Dekker Inc., 1998.

[4] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and P.J. Slater, Domination in Graphs Advanced Topics, Marcel Dekker Inc., 1998.

[5] E. Sampathkumar and H.B. Walikar, the connected domination number of a graph, J. Math. Phys. Sci., 13(1979), 607-613.

[6] V. Swaminathan and K.M. Dharmalingam Studies in Graph Theory "Equ

Received: January, 2012